

Appl. No. : 10/618,957
Filed : July 14, 2003

REMARKS

Claim 23 is amended herein to incorporate the elements of Claim 8 and to address the antecedent basis of the term “antistatic agent.” The amendments do not change the scope of Claim 23 in any way. Claims 10-13, 15, 19 and 20 are amended to depend from Claim 23 in view of the cancellation of Claim 8. The claim amendments do not add new matter.

Claims 8, 14, 21 and 22 are canceled herein without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter contained therein. Applicants maintain that the cancellation of a claim makes no admission as to its patentability and reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in this or any other patent application.

Upon entry of the amendments, Claims 10-12, 14, 15, 19, 20 and 23 are under examination. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite because the term “antistatic agent” lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 23 is amended to clarify that the previously-recited “antistatic agent” is the term “polymers having pyrrolidinium rings” as previously recited in Claim 8, and as now recited in Claim 23. This amendment does not add new matter or change the scope of the claim because the recited “polymers having pyrrolidinium rings” (previously recited in Claim 8, now recited in Claim 23) are the antistatic agent (previously recited in Claim 23, which previously depended from Claim 8). Accordingly, all language of Claim 23 now possesses antecedent basis, and the scope of Claim 23 is unchanged. Reconsideration and removal of this ground for rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8, 10-12, 14, 15, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Sumi (US Pat No 6,582,789) in view of Masuda (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0064650).

Claims 8, 14, 21 and 22 are canceled herein. Accordingly, the rejection as to these claims is moot.

Appl. No. : 10/618,957
Filed : July 14, 2003

Claims 10-12, 15, 19 and 20 are amended herein to depend from Claim 23. Claim 23 is non-obvious over the cited references because no combination of the cited references would lead one of ordinary skill to the invention as claimed in Claim 23. This is confirmed by the Office Action, which does not reject Claim 23 as being obvious over these references. In view of the amendments to Claims 10-12, 15, 19 and 20, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of this ground for rejection of the claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8, 10-12, 14, 15 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over JP 11-256116 in view of Masuda.

Claims 8, 14, 21 and 22 are canceled herein. Accordingly, the rejection as to these claims is moot.

Claims 10-12, 15 and 20 are amended herein to depend from Claim 23. Claim 23 is non-obvious over the cited references because no combination of the cited references would lead one of ordinary skill to the invention as claimed in Claim 23. This is confirmed by the Office Action, which does not reject Claim 23 as being obvious over these references. In view of the amendments to Claims 10-12, 15 and 20, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of this ground for rejection of the claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over JP 11-256116 in view of Masuda and Sumi.

Claim 19 is amended to depend from Claim 23. As discussed above, Claim 23 is non-obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Claim 19 also is non-obvious over the cited references. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of this ground for rejection of the claims.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this

Appl. No. : 10/618,957
Filed : July 14, 2003

application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

CONCLUSION

In light of the Applicants' amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: November 24, 2010 By: /Kerry Taylor/
Kerry Taylor
Registration No. 43,947
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

10042865
112210